arXiv:1611.07833v1 [math.NA] 23 Nov 2016

Multi-level Monte Carlo methods with the Truncated Euler-Maruyama Scheme for Stochastic Differential Equations

Qian Guo[a] Wei Liu[a] Xuerong Mao[b] and Weijun Zhan[a] *

Abstract

In this paper, the truncated Euler-Maruyama (EM) method is employed together with the Multi-level Monte Carlo (MLMC) method to approximate the expectations of functions of solutions to stochastic differential equations (SDEs). The convergence rate and the computational cost of the approximations using the truncated EM method with the MLMC method are proved when the coefficients of SDEs fulfill the local Lipschitz and Khasminskii-type conditions. Numerical examples are given to demonstrate the theoretical results.

Keywords: truncated Euler-Maruyama method; Multi-level Monte Carlo method; stochastic differential equations; non-linear coefficient; approximation to expectation

1 Introduction

Stochastic differential equations (SDEs), as a powerful tool to capture the uncertain phenomenon in the evolution of systems, have been broadly discussed and applied in many areas [2, 3, 15, 20, 21]. However, the explicit solutions of SDEs can rarely be found. Therefore, the numerical approximation becomes an essential approach in displaying the solutions to SDEs. Monographs [13, 18] provide detailed introductions and discussions to various classic methods.

Since the nonlinear coefficients have been widely adapted in SDE models [1, 6, 19], explicit numerical methods that have good convergence property for SDEs with non-global Lipschitz drift and diffusion coefficients are of interest to many researchers and required by practitioners. The authors in [8] developed a quite general approach to prove the strong convergence of numerical methods for nonlinear SDEs. The approach to prove the global strong convergence via the local convergences for SDEs with locally Lipschitz coefficients was

*Corresponding author. Email: weijunzhan@hotmail.com
[a]Department of Mathematics, Shanghai Normal University, Shanghai, China;
[b]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK

studied in [24]. More recently, the tamed technique was developed to handle the non-globally Lipschitz coefficients [10, 11]. Simplified proof of the tamed Euler method and the tamed Milstein method can be found in [22] and [25], respectively. The truncated EM method was developed in [16, 17], which is also targeting on SDEs with non-globally Lipschitz coefficients. Explicit methods for nonlinear SDEs that preserve positivity can be found in, for example [7, 14].

Compared to the explicit method mentioned above, the methods with implicit term have better convergence property in approximating non-global Lipschitz SDEs with the trade-off-of the relatively expensive computational cost. We just mention a few of the works [9, 23, 26] and the references therein.

In many situations, the expected values of the functions of the solution are also of interest. To estimate the expected values of the functions of the solution to some SDEs, the classic Monte-Carlo method is a good and natural candidate. Giles [4, 5] developed the MLMC method, which improves the convergence rate and reduces the computational cost. The classic EM method with the MLMC has been proved divergence to SDEs with non-global Lipschitz coefficients [12]. Then it is interesting to investigate the behaviors of those methods developed particularly for SDEs with non-global Lipschitz coefficients. In [12], the tamed Euler method was combined with the MLMC to approximate expectations of nonlinear functions of solutions to nonlinear SDEs.

In this paper, we embed the MLMC method with the truncated EM method and study the convergence and the computational cost of this combination to approximate the expectations of some nonlinear functions of the solutions to SDEs with non-global Lipschitz coefficients.

In [17], the truncated EM method has been proved to converge to the true solution with order $1/2 - \varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$. In this paper, we first modify Theorem 3.1 in [5] to enable the theorem to cover the truncated EM method. Then we use the modified theorem to prove the convergence and the computational cost of the truncated Euler method with the MLMC method. Numerical examples for SDEs with non-global Lipschitz coefficients and expectations of nonlinear functions are given to demonstrate the theoretical results.

This paper is constructed as follows. Notations, assumptions and some existing results about the truncated EM and MLMC methods are introduced in Section 2. Section 3 proposes the main theorem on computational complexity. A numerical example is discussed, in Section 4, to illustrate theoretical results. In the appendix, we give the proof of the main theorem presented in Section 3.

2 Mathematical Preliminary

Throughout this paper, unless otherwise specified, we let $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a complete probability space with a filtration $\{\mathscr{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ satisfying the usual condition (that is, it is right continuous and increasing while $\mathscr{F}_0$ contain all $\mathbb{P}-$null sets), and let $\mathbb{E}$ denote the expectation corresponding to $\mathbb{P}$. Let $B(t)$ be an m-dimensional Brownian motion defined on the space. If A is a vector or matrix, its transpose is denoted by A^T. If $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $|x|$ is the Euclidean norm. If A

is a matrix, we let $|A| = \sqrt{\text{trace}(A^T A)}$ be its trace norm. If A is a symmetric matrix, denote by $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ its largest and smallest eigenvalue, respectively. Moreover, for two real numbers a and b, we use $a \vee b = \max(a, b)$ and $a \wedge b = \min(a, b)$. If G is a set, its indicator function is denotes by $I_G(x) = 1$ if $x \in G$ and 0 otherwise.

Here we consider an SDE

$$dX(t) = \mu(X(t))dt + \sigma(X(t))dB(t) \tag{1}$$

on $t \geq 0$ with the initial value $X(0) = X_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where

$$\mu : \mathbb{R}^d \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times m}.$$

Up to 2002, when the coefficients obey the global Lipschitz condition, the strong convergence properties of numerical methods for solving SDE have been well studied. When the coefficients μ and σ are local Lipschitz continuous, without the linear growth condition, Mao [16, 17] recently developed the truncated EM method. Firstly, let us review this method briefly. We first choose a strictly increasing continuous functions $\omega : \mathbb{R}_+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\omega(r) \longrightarrow \infty$ as $r \longrightarrow \infty$ and

$$\sup_{|x| \leq u} (|\mu(x)| \vee |\sigma(x)|) \leq \omega(u), \quad \forall u \geq 1. \tag{2}$$

Denote by ω^{-1} the inverse function of ω and we see that ω^{-1} is a strictly increasing continuous function from $[\omega(0), \infty)$ to R_+. We also choose a number $s_l^* \in (0, 1]$ and a strictly decreasing function $h : (0, s_l^*] \longrightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that

$$h(s_l^*) \geq \omega(2), \quad \lim_{s_l \to 0} h(s_l) = \infty \ \text{ and } \ s_l^{1/4} h(s_l) \leq 1, \quad \forall s_l \in (0, s_l^*]. \tag{3}$$

For a given stepsize $s_l \in (0, 1)$, let us define the truncated functions

$$\mu_{s_l}(x) = \mu\left((|x| \wedge \omega^{-1}(h(s_l)))\frac{x}{|x|}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{s_l}(x) = \sigma\left((|x| \wedge \omega^{-1}(h(s_l)))\frac{x}{|x|}\right)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where we set $x/|x| = 0$ when $x = 0$. Moreover, let $\overline{X}_{s_l}(t)$ denote the approximation to $X(t)$ using the truncated EM method with time step size $s_l = M^{-l}T$ for $l = 0, 1, \ldots, L$. The numerical solutions $\overline{X}_{s_l}(t_k)$ for $t_k = k s_l$ are formed by setting $\overline{X}_{s_l}(0) = X_0$ and computing

$$\overline{X}_{s_l}(t_{k+1}) = \overline{X}_{s_l}(t_k) + \mu_{s_l}(\overline{X}_{s_l}(t_k))s_l + \sigma_{s_l}(\overline{X}_{s_l}(t_k))\Delta B_k \tag{4}$$

for $k = 0, 1, \ldots$, where $\Delta B_k = B(t_{k+1}) - B(t_k)$.

Now we give some assumptions to guarantee the truncated EM solution (4) will converge to the true solution of the SDE (1) in the sense of strong convergence.

Assumption 2.1 *The coefficients satisfy the Khasminskii-type condition: there is a pair of constants $p > 2$ and $K > 0$ such that*

$$x^T\mu(x) + \frac{p-1}{2}|\sigma(x)|^2 \leq K(1+|x|^2) \tag{5}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Assumption 2.2 *There is a pair of constants $q \geq 2$ and $H_1 > 0$ such that*

$$(x-y)^T(\mu(x)-\mu(y)) + \frac{q-1}{2}|\sigma(x)-\sigma(y)|^2 \leq H_1|x-y|^2 \tag{6}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Assumption 2.3 *There is a pair of positive constants ρ and H_2 such that*

$$|\mu(x)-\mu(y)|^2 \vee |\sigma(x)-\sigma(y)|^2 \leq H_2(1+|x|^\rho+|y|^\rho)|x-y|^2 \tag{7}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Assumption 2.4 *There exists a constant c such that*

$$|f(x)-f(y)| \leq c(1+|x|^c+|y|^c)|x-y| \tag{8}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

To estimate the expected values of the functions of the solution of the SDE (1), the classic Monte-Carlo method is a good and natural candidate, but the computational complexity of Monte-Carlo method has much expenditure, so Giles [4, 5] developed the MLMC method. Let $f(X(t))$ denote a function of the solution of SDE for a given Brownian path $B(t)$, and let $f(\overline{X}_{s_l}(t)))$ denote the corresponding approximation using a numerical discretisation with step length s_l. It is clearly true that

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\overline{X}_{s_L}(T))] = \mathbb{E}[f(\overline{X}_{s_0}(T))] + \sum_{l=1}^{L}\mathbb{E}[f(\overline{X}_{s_l}(T)) - f(\overline{X}_{s_{l-1}}(T))].$$

Let Y_0 be an estimator for $\mathbb{E}[f(\overline{X}_{s_0}(T))]$ using N_0 samples, and let Y_l for $l > 0$ be an estimator for $\mathbb{E}[f(\overline{X}_{s_l}(T)) - f(\overline{X}_{s_{l-1}}(T))]$ using N_l paths, for example, for $l > 0$, we choose

$$Y_l = \frac{1}{N_l}\sum_{i=1}^{N_l}\left[f(\overline{X}^{(i)}_{s_l}(T)) - f(\overline{X}^{(i)}_{s_{l-1}}(T))\right].$$

The multi-level method independently estimates each of the expectations on the right-hand side, we can, in this way, minimise the computational complexity, see [5] for more details.

3 Main Results

In this section, Theorem 3.1 in [5] is slightly generalised. Then the convergence rate and computational complexity of the truncated EM method combined with the MLMC method are studied.

3.1 Generalised theorem for the MLMC

Theorem 3.1 *If there exist independent estimators Y_l based on N_l Monte Carlo samples, and positive constants $\alpha, \beta, c_1, c_2, c_3$ such that*

1) $\mathbb{E}[f(\overline{X}_{s_l}(T)) - f(X(T))] \leq c_1 s_l^{\alpha}$,

2)

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_l] = \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}[f(\overline{X}_{s_0}(T))], & l = 0, \\ \mathbb{E}[f(\overline{X}_{s_l}(T)) - f(\overline{X}_{s_{l-1}}(T))], & l > 0, \end{cases}$$

3) $Var[Y_l] \leq c_2 N_l^{-1} s_l^{\beta}$,

4) the computational complexity of Y_l, named C_l, is bounded by

$$C_l \leq c_3 N_l s_l^{-1},$$

then there exists a positive constant c_4 such that for any $\varepsilon < e^{-1}$, there are values L and N_l for which the multi-level estimator

$$Y = \sum_{l=0}^{L} Y_l$$

has a mean square error (MSE) with bound

$$MSE \equiv \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(Y - \mathbb{E}[f(X(T))]\Big)^2\Big] < \varepsilon^2.$$

Further, the upper bound of computational complexity of Y, named C, is given by

$$C \leq \begin{cases} c_3(2c_5^2 c_2 + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha})\varepsilon^{-1/\alpha}, & \alpha \leq (-log\varepsilon)/log[(log\varepsilon/\varepsilon)^2], \\ c_3(2c_5^2 c_2 + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha})\varepsilon^{-2}(log\varepsilon)^2, & \alpha > (-log\varepsilon)/log[(log\varepsilon/\varepsilon)^2] \end{cases}$$

for $\beta = 1$,

$$C \leq \begin{cases} c_3[2c_2 T^{\beta-1}(1 - M^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-2} + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha}]\varepsilon^{-2}, & \alpha \geq \frac{1}{2}, \\ c_3[2c_2 T^{\beta-1}(1 - M^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-2} + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha}]\varepsilon^{-1/\alpha}, & \alpha > \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$$

for $\beta > 1$, and

$$C \leq \begin{cases} c_3[2c_2(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{(1-\beta)/\alpha} M^{1-\beta}(1 - M^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-2} + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha}]\varepsilon^{-2-(1-\beta)/\alpha}, & \beta \leq 2\alpha, \\ c_3[2c_2(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{(1-\beta)/\alpha} M^{1-\beta}(1 - M^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-2} + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha}]\varepsilon^{-1/\alpha}, & \beta > 2\alpha \end{cases}$$

for $0 < \beta < 1$.

Remark 3.2 *The main difference of Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.1 in [5] lies in the condition 1). In [5], one needs* $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{2}$. *In this paper, this condition is substituted by* $\alpha > 0$.

3.2 Specific theorem for truncated Euler with the MLMC

Next we consider the multi-level Monte Carlo path simulation with truncated EM method and compute their computational complexity by the Theorem 3.1.

From Theorem 3.8 in [17], under Assumptions 2.1-2.3, for every small $s_l \in (0, s_l^*)$, where $s_l^* \in (0,1)$ and for all $T > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}|X(T) - \overline{X}_{s_l}(T)|^{\overline{q}} \leq c\ s_l^{\overline{q}/2}\ (h(s_l))^{\overline{q}}, \tag{9}$$

for $\overline{q} \geq 2$. If $\overline{q} = 1$, by using the Holder inequality, we also know that

$$\mathbb{E}|X(T) - \overline{X}_{s_l}(T)| \leq \left(\mathbb{E}|X(T) - \overline{X}_{s_l}(T)|^2\right)^{1/2} \leq (cs_l(h(s_l))^2)^{1/2} = cs_l^{1/2}h(s_l),$$

so we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[|f(\overline{X}_{s_l}(T)) - f(X(T))|] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}[c(1 + |\overline{X}_{s_l}(T)|^c + |X(T)|^c)|\overline{X}_{s_l}(T) - X(T)|] \leq c(\mathbb{E}|\overline{X}_{s_l}(T) - X(T)|^2)^{1/2} \\
&\leq cs_l^{1/2}h(s_l)
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

with the polynomial growth condition (8). This implies that $\alpha = 1/4$ for the truncated EM scheme.

Next we consider the variance of Y_l. It follows that

$$Var[f(\overline{X}_{s_l}(T)) - f(X(T))] \leq \mathbb{E}[\left(f(\overline{X}_{s_l}(T)) - f(X(T))\right)^2] \leq cs_l(h(s_l))^2 \tag{11}$$

by (10). Further, note that

$$f(\overline{X}_{s_l}(T)) - f(\overline{X}_{s_{l-1}}(T)) = [f(\overline{X}_{s_l}(T)) - f(X(T))] - [f(\overline{X}_{s_{l-1}}(T)) - f(X(T))],$$

thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&Var[f(\overline{X}_{s_l}(T)) - f(\overline{X}_{s_{l-1}}(T))] \\
&= Var[f(\overline{X}_{s_l}(T)) - f(X(T))] + Var[f(\overline{X}_{s_{l-1}}(T)) - f(X(T))] \\
&\leq cs_l(h(s_l))^2 + cs_{l-1}(h(s_{l-1}))^2 \\
&\leq cs_l^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

by using $s_l^{\frac{1}{4}}\ h(s_l) \leq 1$ from (3). So we have $\beta = 1/2$ for the truncated EM method.

According to the Theorem 3.1, it is easy to find that the upper bound of the computational complexity of Y is

$$\left[4c_1^2c_2c_3\sqrt{M}(1 - M^{-1/4})^{-2} + \frac{4M^2}{M-1}c_1^4c_3\right]\varepsilon^{-4}.$$

4 Simulations

To illustrate the theoretical results, we consider the scalar SDE

$$dx(t) = (x(t) - x^3(t))dt + |x(t)|^{3/2}dB(t), \quad t \geq 0,\ x(0) = x_0 \in \mathbb{R} \tag{12}$$

where $B(t)$ is a scalar Brownian motion. This is a specified Lewis stochastic volatility model. According to Examples 3.5 and 3.9 in [17], we sample over 1000 discretized Brownian paths and use stepsizes $s_l = T/2^l$ for $l = 1, 2, \ldots, 5$ in truncated EM. Let $\hat{Y}_l$ denote the sample value of Y_l. Here we set $T = 1$ and $h(s_l) = s_l^{-1/4}$. Table 1 shows that the solution of (12) generated by the MLMC approach together with the classic EM method is divergent. However it is convergent to solve (12) by using the MLMC method combined with the truncated EM scheme, see Table 2.

Table 1: Numerical results using the MLMC with the classic EM method

l	1	2	3	4	5
$\hat{Y}_l$	1.00	2.59e+102	-2.94e+159	—	—

Table 2: Numerical results using the MLMC with the truncated EM method

l	1	2	3	4	5
$\hat{Y}_l$	0.39	-0.18	-0.024	-0.003	-0.0006

Further, the computational cost can be saved by using MLMC method compared to the standard Monte Carlo method. From Figure 1, we can seen that the MLMC method is approximately 10 times more efficient than the standard Monte Carlo method when ε is sufficient small.

Appendix

Proof of Theorem 3.1.

Using the notation $\lceil x \rceil$ to denote the unique integer n satisfying the inequalities $x \leq n < x + 1$, we start by choosing L to be

$$L = \lceil \frac{log(\sqrt{2}c_1 T^{\alpha} \varepsilon^{-1})}{\alpha log M} \rceil,$$

so that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} M^{-\alpha} \varepsilon < c_1 s_L^{\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon,$$



Figure 1: Computational cost

and hence, by properties 1) and 2),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big(\mathbb{E}[Y] - \mathbb{E}[f(X(T))]\big)^2 \\
=&\Big(\mathbb{E}[\sum_{l=0}^{L} Y_l] - \mathbb{E}[f(X(T))]\Big)^2 \\
=&(\mathbb{E}[f(\overline{X}_{s_L}(T)) - f(X(T))])^2 \\
\leq&(c_1 s_L^{\alpha})^2 \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

so we have $(\mathbb{E}[Y] - \mathbb{E}[f(X)])^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2$. This $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2$ upper bound on the square of bias error, together with the $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2$ upper bound on the variance of the estimator to be proved later, giver an ε^2 upper bound on the estimator MSE.

Also,

$$\sum_{l=0}^{L} s_l^{-1} = s_L^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{L} M^{-i} < \frac{M}{M-1} s_L^{-1},$$

using the standard result for a geometric series and due to the inequality $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} M^{-\alpha}\varepsilon < c_1 s_L^{\alpha}$, so

$$s_L^{-1} < M(\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{2}c_1})^{-1/\alpha}.$$

Finally we have

$$\sum_{l=0}^{L} s_l^{-1} < \frac{M}{M-1} s_L^{-1} < \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{-1/\alpha}\varepsilon^{-1/\alpha}. \tag{14}$$

We now need to consider the different possible values for β and to compare to the α.

(a) If $\beta = 1$, we set $N_l = \lceil 2\varepsilon^{-2}(L+1)c_2 s_l \rceil$ so that

$$V[Y] = \sum_{l=0}^{L} V[Y_l] \leq \sum_{l=0}^{L} c_2 N_l^{-1} s_l \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2,$$

which is the required upper bound on the variance of the estimator.

To bound the computational complexity C,

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \sum_{l=0}^{L} C_l \leq c_3 \sum_{l=0}^{L} N_l s_l^{-1} \\ &\leq c_3 \sum_{l=0}^{L} (2\varepsilon^{-2}(L+1)c_2 s_l + 1) s_l^{-1} \\ &\leq c_3 (2\varepsilon^{-2}(L+1)^2 c_2 + \sum_{l=0}^{L} s_l) \\ &\leq c_3 (2\varepsilon^{-2}(L+1)^2 c_2 + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{-1/\alpha}\varepsilon^{-1/\alpha}). \end{aligned}$$

According to the definite of the L, we have

$$L \leq \frac{log\varepsilon^{-1}}{\alpha log M} + \frac{log(\sqrt{2}c_1 T^\alpha)}{\alpha log M} + 1.$$

Given that $1 < log\varepsilon^{-1}$ for $\varepsilon < e^{-1}$, it follows that

$$L + 1 \leq c_5 log\varepsilon^{-1},$$

where

$$c_5 = \frac{1}{\alpha log M} + max(0, \frac{log(\sqrt{2}c_1 T^\alpha)}{\alpha log M}) + 2.$$

Hence, the computation complexity is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} C &\leq c_3 (2\varepsilon^{-2} c_5^2 (log\varepsilon^{-1})^2 c_2 + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha}\varepsilon^{-1/\alpha}) \\ &= c_3 (2\varepsilon^{-2} c_5^2 (log\varepsilon)^2 c_2 + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha}\varepsilon^{-1/\alpha}). \end{aligned}$$

So if $\alpha \leq (-log\varepsilon)/log[(log\varepsilon/\varepsilon)^2]$, then

$$C \leq c_3 (2c_5^2 c_2 + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha})\varepsilon^{-1/\alpha},$$

else $\alpha > (-log\varepsilon)/log[(log\varepsilon/\varepsilon)^2]$, then

$$C \leq c_3 (2c_5^2 c_2 + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha})\varepsilon^{-2}(log\varepsilon)^2.$$

(b) For $\beta > 1$, setting

$$N_l = \lceil 2\varepsilon^{-2} c_2 T^{(\beta-1)/2}(1 - M^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-1} s_l^{(\beta+1)/2} \rceil,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} V[Y] &= \sum_{l=0}^{L} V[Y_l] \le \sum_{l=0}^{L} c_2 N_l^{-1} s_l^{\beta} \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 T^{-(\beta-1)/2}(1 - M^{-(\beta-1)/2}) \sum_{l=0}^{L} s_l^{(\beta-1)/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the stand result for a geometric series,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=0}^{L} s_l^{(\beta-1)/2} &= T^{(\beta-1)/2} \sum_{l=0}^{L} (M^{-(\beta-1)/2})^l \\ &< T^{(\beta-1)/2}(1 - M^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

then we obtain the upper bound of variance is $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2$. So the computation complexity is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} C &\le c_3 \sum_{l=0}^{L} N_l s_l^{-1} \\ &\le c_3 \sum_{l=0}^{L} (2\varepsilon^{-2} c_2 T^{(\beta-1)/2}(1 - M^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-1} s_l^{(\beta+1)/2} + 1) s_l^{-1} \\ &= c_3 [2\varepsilon^{-2} c_2 T^{(\beta-1)/2}(1 - M^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-1} \sum_{l=0}^{L} s_l^{(\beta-1)/2} + \sum_{l=0}^{L} s_l^{-1}] \\ &\le c_3 [2\varepsilon^{-2} c_2 T^{(\beta-1)/2}(1 - M^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-1} T^{(\beta-1)/2}(1 - M^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-1} \\ &+ \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha}\varepsilon^{-1/\alpha}] \\ &= c_3 [2\varepsilon^{-2} c_2 T^{\beta-1}(1 - M^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-2} + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha}\varepsilon^{-1/\alpha}]. \end{aligned}$$

So when $\alpha \ge \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$C \le c_3 [2c_2 T^{\beta-1}(1 - M^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-2} + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha}]\varepsilon^{-2},$$

else $\alpha \le \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$C \le c_3 [2c_2 T^{\beta-1}(1 - M^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-2} + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha}]\varepsilon^{-1/\alpha}.$$

(c) For $0 < \beta < 1$, setting

$$N_l = \lceil 2\varepsilon^{-2} c_2 s_L^{(\beta-1)/2}(1 - M^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-1} s_l^{(\beta+1)/2} \rceil,$$

then

$$
\begin{aligned}
V[Y] &= \sum_{l=0}^{L} V[Y_l] \leq \sum_{l=0}^{L} c_2 N_l^{-1} s_l^{\beta} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 s_L^{(1-\beta)/2}(1-M^{-(1-\beta)/2}) \sum_{l=0}^{L} s_l^{-(1-\beta)/2} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 s_L^{(1-\beta)/2}(1-M^{-(1-\beta)/2}) s_L^{-(1-\beta)/2} \sum_{l=0}^{L} (M^{-(1-\beta)/2})^l \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 s_L^{(1-\beta)/2}(1-M^{-(1-\beta)/2}) s_L^{-(1-\beta)/2}(1-M^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-1} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Final using the N_l upper bound, the computational complexity is

$$
\begin{aligned}
C &\leq c_3 \sum_{l=0}^{L} N_l s_l^{-1} \\
&\leq c_3 \sum_{l=0}^{L} (2\varepsilon^{-2} c_2 s_L^{(\beta-1)/2}(1-M^{-(\beta-1)/2})^{-1} s_l^{(\beta+1)/2} + 1) s_l^{-1} \\
&= c_3 [2\varepsilon^{-2} c_2 s_L^{(\beta-1)/2}(1-M^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-1} \sum_{l=0}^{L} s_l^{(\beta-1)/2} + \sum_{l=0}^{L} s_l^{-1}] \\
&\leq c_3 [2\varepsilon^{-2} c_2 s_L^{-(1-\beta)}(1-M^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-2} + \sum_{l=0}^{L} s_l^{-1}].
\end{aligned}
$$

because of the inequality $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} M^{-\alpha}\varepsilon < c_1 s_L^{\alpha}$, we have

$$
s_L^{-(1-\beta)} < (\sqrt{2}c_1)^{(1-\beta)/\alpha} M^{1-\beta} \varepsilon^{-(1-\beta)/\alpha},
$$

then

$$
\begin{aligned}
C &\leq c_3 [2\varepsilon^{-2} c_2 s_L^{-(1-\beta)}(1-M^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-2} + \sum_{l=0}^{L} s_l^{-1}] \\
&\leq c_3 [2\varepsilon^{-2} c_2 (\sqrt{2}c_1)^{(1-\beta)/\alpha} M^{1-\beta} \varepsilon^{-(1-\beta)/\alpha}(1-M^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-2} + \sum_{l=0}^{L} s_l^{-1}] \\
&\leq c_3 [2\varepsilon^{-2} c_2 (\sqrt{2}c_1)^{(1-\beta)/\alpha} M^{1-\beta} \varepsilon^{-(1-\beta)/\alpha}(1-M^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-2} + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha}\varepsilon^{-1/\alpha}] \\
&= c_3 [2c_2 (\sqrt{2}c_1)^{(1-\beta)/\alpha} M^{1-\beta}(1-M^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-2} \varepsilon^{-2-(1-\beta)/\alpha} + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha}\varepsilon^{-1/\alpha}].
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\beta \leq 2\alpha$, then $\varepsilon^{-2-(1-\beta)/\alpha} > \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$, so we have

$$
C \leq c_3 [2c_2 (\sqrt{2}c_1)^{(1-\beta)/\alpha} M^{1-\beta}(1-M^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-2} + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha}] \varepsilon^{-2-(1-\beta)/\alpha},
$$

else $\beta > 2\alpha$, then $\varepsilon^{-2-(1-\beta)/\alpha} < \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}}$, so we have

$$C \leq c_3[2c_2(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{(1-\beta)/\alpha}M^{1-\beta}(1-M^{-(1-\beta)/2})^{-2} + \frac{M^2}{M-1}(\sqrt{2}c_1)^{1/\alpha}]\varepsilon^{-1/\alpha}.$$

References

[1] Y. Ait-Sahalia, Testing continuous-time models of the spot interest rate, *Rev. Financ. Stud.* 9 (1996), pp. 385–426.

[2] E. Allen, *Modeling with Itô stochastic differential equations*, Mathematical Modelling: Theory and Applications, Vol. 22, Springer, Dordrecht, 2007.

[3] C.W. Gardiner, *Handbook of stochastic methods for physics, chemistry and the natural sciences*, Springer Series in Synergetics, Vol. 13, 3rd ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.

[4] M.B. Giles, Improved multilevel monte carlo convergence using the milstein scheme, in *Monte Carlo and quasi-Monte Carlo methods 2006*, Springer, Berlin, 2008, pp. 343–358.

[5] M.B. Giles, Multilevel monte carlo path simulation, *Oper. Res.* 56 (2008), pp. 607–617.

[6] A. Gray, D. Greenhalgh, L. Hu, X. Mao, and J. Pan, A stochastic differential equation SIS epidemic model, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 71 (2011), pp. 876–902.

[7] N. Halidias, Constructing positivity preserving numerical schemes for the two-factor CIR model, *Monte Carlo Methods Appl.* 21 (2015), pp. 313–323.

[8] D.J. Higham, X. Mao, and A.M. Stuart, Strong convergence of Euler-type methods for nonlinear stochastic differential equations, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 40 (2002), pp. 1041–1063.

[9] Y. Hu, *Semi-implicit Euler-Maruyama scheme for stiff stochastic equations*, in *Stochastic analysis and related topics, V (Silivri, 1994)*, Progr. Probab., Vol. 38, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1996, pp. 183–202.

[10] M. Hutzenthaler and A. Jentzen, Numerical approximations of stochastic differential equations with non-globally Lipschitz continuous coefficients, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 236 (2015), pp. v+99.

[11] M. Hutzenthaler, A. Jentzen, and P.E. Kloeden, Strong convergence of an explicit numerical method for SDEs with nonglobally Lipschitz continuous coefficients, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 22 (2012), pp. 1611–1641.

[12] M. Hutzenthaler, A. Jentzen, and P.E. Kloeden, Divergence of the multilevel Monte Carlo Euler method for nonlinear stochastic differential equations, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 23 (2013), pp. 1913–1966.

[13] P.E. Kloeden and E. Platen, *Numerical solution of stochastic differential equations*, Applications of Mathematics (New York), Vol. 23, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.

[14] W. Liu and X. Mao, Strong convergence of the stopped Euler-Maruyama method for nonlinear stochastic differential equations, *Appl. Math. Comput.* 223 (2013), pp. 389–400.

[15] X. Mao, *Stochastic differential equations and applications*, 2nd ed., Horwood Publishing Limited, Chichester, 2008.

[16] X. Mao, The truncated Euler-Maruyama method for stochastic differential equations, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 290 (2015), pp. 370–384.

[17] X. Mao, Convergence rates of the truncated Euler-Maruyama method for stochastic differential equations, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 296 (2016), pp. 362–375.

[18] G.N. Milstein and M.V. Tretyakov, *Stochastic numerics for mathematical physics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2004).

[19] Y. Niu, K. Burrage, and L. Chen, Modelling biochemical reaction systems by stochastic differential equations with reflection, *J. Theoret. Biol.* 396 (2016), pp. 90–104.

[20] B. Øksendal, *Stochastic differential equations*, sixth ed., Universitext, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003, an introduction with applications.

[21] E. Platen and D. Heath, *A benchmark approach to quantitative finance*, Springer Finance, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.

[22] S. Sabanis, A note on tamed Euler approximations, *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 18 (2013), pp. no. 47, 10.

[23] L. Szpruch, X. Mao, D.J. Higham, and J. Pan, Numerical simulation of a strongly nonlinear Ait-Sahalia-type interest rate model, *BIT* 51 (2011), pp. 405–425.

[24] M.V. Tretyakov and Z. Zhang, A fundamental mean-square convergence theorem for SDEs with locally Lipschitz coefficients and its applications, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 51 (2013), pp. 3135–3162.

[25] X. Wang and S. Gan, The tamed Milstein method for commutative stochastic differential equations with non-globally Lipschitz continuous coefficients, *J. Difference Equ. Appl.* 19 (2013), pp. 466–490.

[26] C. Yue, C. Huang, and F. Jiang, Strong convergence of split-step theta methods for non-autonomous stochastic differential equations, *Int. J. Comput. Math.* 91 (2014), pp. 2260–2275.